

*Attorney docket SAT 201***REMARKS**

Amended claims 3 and 7 recite two positions: a predetermined attraction position (already recited as just a "predetermined position") and a detection position. The detection position is supported at page 16, line 1 (now amended; see the preceding page), reading (before this amendment), "The work detector 4 detects wafers 14 on a tray 30 *approaching* a predetermined position" (emphasis added). If they are detected while approaching the predetermined position, they must be detected at another and different point, namely, a detection point.

The amended claims also recite that the work is attracted simultaneously with the work coming to the attraction point. This feature is also supported in the same paragraph at page 16, line 1, amended above, reading, "the controller 25 ... starts attracting the wafers 14, and simultaneously drives the work pushing-up portion 21 to push up the wafers 14."

In response to the outstanding Action:

[1] Claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 were rejected under § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 7 are amended as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

[2] Claims 3, 7, and 10 were rejected under § 102 over Suzuki. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

No Detector. Independent claims 3 and 7, as amended, recite detection at a detection point which is ahead of the attraction point. Suzuki does not disclose detecting the work, and does not need any detection because the work pieces are mechanically brought to the correct position. Suzuki uses tape with perforations (see Figs. 15C, 29A, and 29B), and states that the tape has "a predetermined pitch" (col. 1, line 18), which can only refer to those perforations. Suzuki also states that the components are deployed at "predetermined intervals" (col. 10, line 16). The tape is driven by a toothed wheel (Fig. 15A). Clearly, the work piece is mechanically and positively moved to the correct position for pickup, and that is the reason no detector or detection is mentioned by Suzuki.

AMENDMENT

□

10/809,683

Attorney docket SAT 201

No Detection Point. As the Applicant's claimed work detector is not disclosed, neither can there be any disclosure of the newly-claimed detection point. The only point ever mentioned by Suzuki is the point at which the tape stops and the work is suctioned, which would correspond to the claimed predetermined attraction point.

No Simultaneity. Suzuki does not disclose that "said controller ... pushes the work up simultaneously with said work attraction section coming to the attraction position," as claims 3 and 7 now recite. Suzuki's Fig. 18 (see col. 2, lines 3-7) shows that suction is simultaneous with the arrival of the suction nozzle at the surface of the tape.¹ However, Fig. 18 does not show anything about pushing up the work-piece component. That is shown in Fig. 1.


Fig. 1 clearly shows sequential steps, starting with lowering the nozzle and ending with transferring the component. The Examiner is invited to note that step #4, pushing the component with a push pin, comes after step #3, applying suction, which comes after step #2, stopping the nozzle above the component.

[3] Claims 4 and 8 were rejected under § 103 over Suzuki in view of McIlwraith. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that combination would have been obvious to prevent damage to the components of Suzuki. With respect, there is no support for this assertion, either by citation or argument. The Applicant previously argued that Suzuki discloses vacuum sucking but McIlwraith teaches against this in ¶[0007]; the Examiner has not addressed this point.

Respectfully submitted,

May 11, 2006
Date


Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)
(717) 426-1664
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23995
Telephone: (202) 371-8976
Telefax : (202) 408-0924

¹ This is prior art, which Suzuki teaches against.
AMENDMENT

□

10/809,683